



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/501,291	07/12/2004	Satoshi Yonchara	10873.1449USWO	7884
52835 7590 07/21/2009 HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER & LARSON, P.C. P.O. BOX 2902 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0902				
EXAMINER				
ARIANI, KADE				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1651				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/21/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/501,291

Applicant(s)

YONEHARA ET AL.

Examiner

KADE ARIANI

Art Unit

1651

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 June 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-11 and 13-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-11 and 13-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S5108)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 06/02/2009
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment filed on June 02, 2009 has been received.

New claim 31 has been added.

Claims 1, 2, and 4-11, and 13-31 are pending in this application and were examined on their merits.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 06/02/2009 has been entered.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, and 4-11, and 13-31, filed on 06/02/2009, have been fully considered but are moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 2, and 4-11, and 13-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows:

In claims 1 and 9 "free".

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 31 recites "... removing hydrogen peroxide generated..." yet the claim fail to set forth the critical metes and bounds of this step. In order to particularly point out

and distinctly set forth the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, the claims must clearly define how the hydrogen peroxide is being removed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, and 4-11, and 13-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komori et al. (European patent application, EP1 002874 A2, Published June 24th, 2000) in view Yoshida et al. (Eur. J. Biochem., 1996, Vol. 242, 499-505) and Ishimaru et al. (Patent number 6,127,138, Date of Patent Oct. 3, 2000), and further in view of Montellano et al. (Biochemistry, 1988, Vol. 27, pp. 5470-5476) and of Kwan et al. (US patent No. 5,556,788), and of Fry et al. (J. Nutr., 1982, Vol. 112, p.1631-p.1737).

Claims 1, 2, and 4-11, and 13-31 are drawn to a method of measuring an amount of a glycosylated protein as an analyte in a sample, comprising: causing a fructosyl amino acid oxidase (FAOD) for degradation (degradation FAOD) to the sample as a pretreatment so that a free amino acid that is glycosylated present in the sample as a

contaminant is degraded and removed from the sample by the degradation FAOD, the pretreatment further comprises removing hydrogen peroxide generated from a redox reaction between the degradation FAOD and the free amino acid that is glycated, adding a protease to the sample to give a degradation product of the analyte remaining in the sample, adding a fructosyl amino acid oxidase for measurement (measurement FAOD) to the sample treated with the protease to cause a redox reaction between the measurement FAPD and the degradation product of the analyte, and measuring an amount of hydrogen peroxide generated by the redox reaction to determine the amount of the analyte, wherein the redox reaction is conducted in the presence of a tetrazolium compound and sodium azide, wherein the measurement FAOD is added after the adding of the protease to the sample, wherein the measurement of the amount of hydrogen peroxide comprises adding a color-developing substrate to allow a redox reaction between the color-developing substrate and the hydrogen peroxide, and measuring an amount of color developed by the color-developing substrate to determine the amount of hydrogen peroxide further comprises, adding N-(carboxymethylaminocarbonyl)-4,4'-bis(dimethylamino) diphenylamine sodium salt as a color-developing substrate to a reaction solution of the redox reaction in the presence of a surfactant, a concentration of the tetrazolium compound in the reaction solution is in a range from 0.5 to 8 mmol/l, a concentration of the sodium azide in the reaction solution is in a range from 0.08 to 0.8 mmol/l, a concentration of the surfactant in the reaction solution is in a range from 0.3 to 10 mmol/l, and a pH of the reaction solution is in a range from 7.0 to 8.5, the tetrazolium compound is 2-(4-iodophenyl)-3-(2,4-

dinitrophenyl)-5- (2,4-disulfophenyl)-2H-tetrazolium salt, and a measuring kit for measuring a glycated protein.

Komori et al. teach a method of measuring an amount of a glycated protein as an analyte in a sample, comprising: causing a fructosyl amino acid oxidase (FAOD) to act on a glycated amino acid present in the sample so that the analyte remains in the sample and the glycated amino acid is removed from the sample by degradation; degrading the analyte with a protease to give a degradation product of the analyte either before or after causing the fructosyl amino acid oxidase to act on the glycated amino acid; then causing a fructosyl amino acid oxidase to act on a proteolytic degradation product of the analyte to cause a redox reaction in the presence of a tetrazolium compound and sodium azide; and measuring an amount of hydrogen peroxide generated by the redox reaction to determine the amount of the analyte, wherein the measurement of the amount of hydrogen peroxide comprises adding a color-developing substrate to allow a redox reaction between the color-developing substrate and the hydrogen peroxide (page 2, 0002-0004, and page 4 0029 and 0030). Komori et al. teach adding a tetrazolium compound prior to the redox reaction or pretreating a sample with a tetrazolium compound to eliminate the influence of any reducing substance (Page 2 0010, and page 8 0072), and further teach the formation of hydrogen peroxide due to the oxidation of glycated proteins by the action of FAOD enzyme, and further teach both glycated peptides (proteins) and glycated amino acids can be subjected to the action of FAOD and glycated proteins and peptides are treated with a protease before its treatment with FAOD (Page 4, Lines 7-9). Komori et al. teach the color developing

substrate N- (carboxymethylaminocarbonyl)-4,4'-bis(dimethylamino) diphenylamine sodium salt (DA-64) as (Page 4, Lines 3-5) and teach adding a surfactant so that its concentration in the treating solution falls in the range of 0.01- 5% by weight (Page.6 Line 5) and the concentration of tetrazolium compound (WST-3) is 1 mmol/L (Page 8, Lines 26 and 27). Komori et al. teach a peroxidase (POD) having a concentration equal to 219 KU/L (Page 17, 0095) and a reducing agent are added to the sample (Page 2, Line 12). Sigma-Aldrich catalogue discloses an active form of metalloproteinase in 10mM MES buffer, containing 0.25 mM sodium chloride and 5 mM calcium chloride and 0.01% sodium azide. Komori et al teach non-ionic surfactants such as Triton X-100 series, Tween series, Brij series and the like (page 5-6, 0044). The pretreatment is usually carried in a buffer and further recites CHES, CAPSO, CAPS, phosphate, Tris, EPPS, HEPES, pH range 8-12 (Page 6, 0047). Komori et al. teach FAOD treatment is carried out in the protease treatment solution for which a Tris-HCl, EPPS, or PIPES buffer can be used and the concentration of FAOD in the reaction solution is 50-50,000 U/L and pH of 6-9 (Page 6, 0052,0055) and 0.146 mM DA-64 (Page 17, 0095). Komori et al. also teach uricase (page7, 0066) and bilirubin oxidase (Page 7, 0064). Komori et al. teach also teach hydrogen peroxide formed by oxidation of glycated amino acids with FAOD (page 3 0030). Komori et al. teach FAOD treatment can be done separately or simultaneously, protease treatment + FAOD treatment (step 3), FAOD treatment + redox treatment (step 4), and the order of adding the FAOD is not limited (p.7 0061 step 3 and 0062). Therefore, Komori et al. teach pretreatment with a measurement FAOD, and adding a measurement FAOD during the redox reaction. Komori et al. further teach

conditions of the FAOD treatment are determined as appropriate depending on the type of FAOD used, the type and the concentration of the glycated proteins (p.6 0054).

Komori et al. do not teach a fructosyl amino acid oxidase for degradation, a fructosyl amino acid oxidase for measurement, aging a solution containing tetrazolium compound, and sodium azide, a free amino acid that is glycated, and a measuring kit. However, Yoshida et al. teach FAODs with different substrate specificities, applicable in the enzymatic measurement of glycated proteins, glycated albumin and for measurement of glycated HbA (Introduction 2nd column 1st paragraph). The FAOD(s) taught by Yoshida et al. are equivalent of the FAOD(s) enzymes disclosed in the specification and perform the same function specified in the claims. Therefore, the claimed "degradation FAOD" is met by Yoshida et al.

Yoshida et al. teach the amount of total glycated serum protein is known to be a more sensitive indicator of the great fluctuations in the blood glucose level generally associated with insulin-dependent diabetes. The FAOD from *P. janthinellum*, which showed higher activity toward Fru-Val, is expected to be applicable to the enzymatic determination of HbA, whose N-terminal valine residue is glycated (p.504 2nd column 3rd paragraph).

Kwan et al. teach storing a reagent comprising tetrazolium compound by leaving the solution to stand at temperature in the range of 20-60°C for 6 to 120 hours (column 4 lines 46-48), adding sodium azide to a control reagent and incubating for 4 days at 37°C (column 6 lines 37-50).

Ishimaru et al. teach a method of removing the hydrogen peroxide generated by the FAOD (FAOD reaction product) (column 9 lines 27-39).

Montellano et al. teach azide anion inhibit catalase and horseradish peroxidase, and using 0.15-0.6 mM sodium azide (p.5470 Introduction, p. 5471, 3rd Paragraph).

Fry et al. teach the formation of glycated amino acids nutritional products (reaction products between glucose and free amino acids, glucose-amino acid) (p.1631 Introduction 1st column 1st paragraph lines 1-6, and p.1636 1st column 2nd paragraph). Fry et al. further teach these products can enter circulation of the patients infused with these solutions (p.1636 2nd column 3rd paragraph).

Further motivation is in Ishimaru et al. who teach measuring an amount of a glycated protein in a sample by causing an oxidoreductase (an enzyme that catalyzes an oxidation-reduction or redox reaction) to act on glycated protein and measuring the amount of the product based on the action of the enzyme (Col.1, lines 61-66). Ishimaru et al. teach measuring a glycated protein for the purpose of the diagnosis of diabetes and further teach the method is applicable to a general-purpose examining apparatus with lower cost for a shorter period of time (Col. 2, Lines 41-44).

Therefore, in view of the above teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, knowing the presence of a contaminant glycated amino acid in the sample (that can interfere with the measurement) and the substrate specificities of the FAOD enzymes, would have been motivated to try and to modify the method as taught by Komori et al. by using FAOD enzyme(s) as taught by Yoshida et

al. to degrade/remove a contaminant glycated amino acid present in a sample in order to provide a method for measuring an amount of glycated protein in a sample with a reasonable expectation of success, because Komori et al. teach glycated amino acids can be subjected to the action of FAOD, and because Yoshida et al. teach degradation FAOD that are applicable in the enzymatic measurement of glycated proteins. The motivation as taught by Yoshida et al. would be to provide a more sensitive enzymatic method. Moreover, a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, knowing the presence of a contaminant glycated amino acid in the sample and the formation of hydrogen peroxide during oxidation of the glycated amino acids with FAOD, would have been motivated to modify the method as taught by Komori et al. by removing the hydrogen peroxide generated from a redox reaction between the degradation FAOD and the glycated free amino acid, and by adding sodium azide to the reagent according to the teachings of Ishimaru et al. and Montellano et al. to provide a method for measuring an amount of glycated protein in a sample with a reasonable expectation of success, because Ishimaru et al. teach removing the hydrogen peroxide generated by the FAOD, and because Montellano et al. teach azide anion inhibit catalase, and using 0.15-0.6 mM sodium azide. The motivation as taught by Montellano et al. would be the ability of sodium azide to inhibit catalase and to prevent bacterial contamination.

Furthermore, once the method of measuring an amount of a glycated protein in an analyte was established, providing a measuring kit to determine the amount of the

glycated protein would become obvious. The motivation as taught by Ishimaru et al. would be to provide a kit for the purpose of the diagnosis of diabetes.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kade Ariani whose telephone number is (571) 272-6083. The examiner can normally be reached on IFP.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Wityshyn can be reached on (571) 272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kade Ariani
Examiner
Art Unit 1651

/Leon B Lankford/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1651